



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

51
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,310	09/29/2000	Ling Thio	PA1208US	1507
22046	7590	07/13/2004	EXAMINER	
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC. DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR 101 CRAWFORDS CORNER ROAD - ROOM 3J-219 HOLMDEL, NJ 07733			JONES, PRENELL P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2667	
DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/675,310	THIO, LING
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Prenell P Jones	2667

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2-7,9-14 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,8,15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 2-7,9-14,16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 6, 9-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaFollette et al in view Case et al and Eastep et al.

Regarding claims 2, 6, 9-13 and 16, LaFollette discloses (Abstract, Fig. 2, 6, col. 3, line 37 thru col. 5, line 61) a communication network whereby optimizing the network performance is a concern, and wherein system performance is monitored and (col. 2, line 15-28, col. 4, line 31-67) a computer system with appropriate software/hardware is used for monitoring system performance, whereby a processor (analysis engine) executes software instructions, processor performs analysis/measuring functionality, processor coupled to ping module, transmitting ping packet and timing the return of the ping packet, measuring error and response time of ping, round-trip delay time is calculated based on a ping (fast-response operation) response time, ping is measured by link hardware after hardware acknowledges a ping presence, and (col. 2, line 15-27) diagnostic node detects ping response. LaFollette is silent on monitor, analysis engine

coupled to a processor and detecting delay. However, in analogous art, Case (Abstract, Fig. 1, col. 4, line 1, thru col. 6, line 67) discloses measuring round-trip delay wherein there is communication between client machine and server machine, computer workstation consisting of display/monitor, processor, software in association with processor (analysis engine), measuring/detecting latency/delay and plurality of predetermined URLs (parameters/definitions) associated with response and Eastep discloses (Figs 18, 21, 24, col. 28, line 16-67, col. 195, line 22-50) analysis services which is special kind of service engine (analysis engines) wherein an Alpha 200 workstation is utilized for operation support whereby a performance software analyzer is associated with Alpha 200 workstations/service engines, workstations consist of monitors, (col. 107, line 10 thru col. 108, line 67) round-trip ping method is implemented to assist in finding best alternative gateway, multiple DSP engines, (col. 89, line 22-50) recognizing the presents of delays, (col. 109, line 33-50) associated with IP ping are echo-type messages (duplicate packets). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement a monitor/display associated with a computer system and recognizing the presents of delays as taught by the combined teachings of Case and Eastep with the teachings of LaFollette for the purpose of further monitoring system performance associated with latency with the assistance of visual presentation of network performance.

Regarding claims 3, 4 and 5, as indicated above, Case (Abstract, Fig. 1, col. 4, line 1, thru col. 6, line 67) discloses measuring round-trip delay wherein there is communication between client machine and server machine, computer workstation consisting of display/monitor, processor, software in association with processor (analysis engine), measuring latency, plurality of predetermined URLs (parameters) associated with

Art Unit: 2667

response. Case further discloses (col. 7, line 17 thru col. 8, line 67) URLs (parameters/definitions) are specified by a user of a client device whereby the user selects from a list of predetermined URLs', whereby URLs are automatically generated by software running on client machine and response time processed at server.

Regarding claim 11 and 12, as indicated above, LaFollette discloses (Abstract, Fig. 2, 6, col. 3, line 37 thru col. 5, line 61) a communication network whereby optimizing the network performance is a concern, and wherein system performance is monitored and (col. 2, line 15-28, col. 4, line 31-67) a computer system with appropriate software/hardware is used for monitoring system performance, whereby a processor (analysis engine) executes software instructions, processor performs analysis/measuring functionality, processor coupled to ping module, transmitting ping packet and timing the return of the ping packet, measuring error and response time of ping, round-trip delay time is calculated based on a ping (fast-response operation) response time, ping is measured by link hardware after hardware acknowledges a ping presence, and (col. 2, line 15-27) diagnostic node detects ping response, and calculating the ping between nodes associated with measured ping traveling time between nodes.

3. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaFollette et al in view of Case et al and Eastep et al as applied to claims 2, 6, 9, 11, 12 and 16 above, and further in view of Borella.

Regarding claims 7 and 14, as indicated above, LaFollette discloses (Abstract, Fig. 2, 6, col. 3, line 37 thru col. 5, line 61) a communication network whereby optimizing the network performance is a concern, and wherein system performance is monitored and

(col. 2, line 15-28, col. 4, line 31-67) a computer system with appropriate software/hardware is used for monitoring system performance, whereby a processor (analysis engine) executes software instructions, processor performs analysis/measuring functionality, processor coupled to ping module, transmitting ping packet and timing the return of the ping packet, measuring error and response time of ping, round-trip delay time is calculated based on a ping (fast-response operation) response time, ping is measured by link hardware after hardware acknowledges a ping presence, and (col. 2, line 15-27) diagnostic node detects ping response. LaFollette is silent on monitor and analysis engine coupled to a processor. However, in analogous art, Case (Abstract, Fig. 1, col. 4, line 1, thru col. 6, line 67) discloses measuring round-trip delay wherein there is communication between client machine and server machine, computer workstation consisting of display/monitor, processor, software in association with processor (analysis engine), measuring latency and plurality of predetermined URLs (parameters/definitions) associated with response, and Eastep discloses (Figs 18, 21, 24, col. 28, line 16-67, col. 195, line 22-50) analysis services which is special kind of service engine (analysis engines) wherein an Alpha 200 workstation is utilized for operation support whereby a performance software analyzer is associated with Alpha 200 workstations/service engines, workstations consist of monitors, (col. 107, line 10 thru col. 108, line 67) round-trip ping method is implemented to assist in finding best alternative gateway, multiple DSP engines, (col. 89, line 22-50) recognizing the presents of delays. LaFollette, Case and Eastep are silent on displaying graphical representations of round trip time. In analogous art, Borella discloses (Abstract, Figs. 1-5, col. 3, line 50 thru col. 7, line 59) monitoring network performance such as latency/round trip delay with the association of ping packets, wherein the ping packets are associated with return timestamps that are used in calculating latency (round-trip) and utilization of user computers/network devices

Art Unit: 2667

which consist of display monitors that accommodate graphical data images. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement a monitor/display associated with a computer system as taught by Borella with the combined teachings of LaFollette, Case and Eastep for the purpose of further managing/monitoring performance of a system in a more detailed aspect, whereby congestion associated with latency in a communication system is a real concern.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prenell P. Jones whose telephone number is 703-305-0630. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on 703-305-4378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Prenell P. Jones

July 08, 2004




CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 7/9/04